



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/016,263	12/10/2001	Nabil M. Lawandy	109960.223US2	4505
23483	7590	06/20/2005	EXAMINER	
WILMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE AND DORR LLP 60 STATE STREET BOSTON, MA 02109			ANGEBRANNDT, MARTIN J	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1756		

DATE MAILED: 06/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/016,263	LAWANDY ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Martin J. Angebranndt	1756	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 March 2005.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 4-7,14-17,25 and 26 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 4-7,14-17,25 and 26 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____

Art Unit: 1756

1. The response of the applicant has been read and given careful consideration. Responses to the arguments of the applicant are provided after the first rejection to which they are directed.

The attorney's signature block recites an incorrect agent number.

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 4-7 and 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

“said chemical compound” lacks antecedent basis.

In claims 25 and 26, it should be made clear that the “read inhibiting agent” is coated on the optical recording medium. See [0023] in prepub. This makes it clear the physical relationship between the medium and the read inhibiting agent. The claims should also make it clear that the getter is not part of the medium for this embodiment.

In claims 4 and 14, please replace “NMP” with - - N-methyl pyrrolidone- -

In claims 5 and 15, please replace “DMF” with - -dimethylformamide- -.

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claims 4-7,14-17 and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the

relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The language "triggering agent" is not present in the specification as filed. This is new matter and must be removed in the next response.

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rollhaus et al. '772, in view of Kamiyama et al. '993.

Rollhaus et al. '772 teaches with respect to figures 3 and 7, the recording medium sealed in a bag which constitutes the barrier layer (28) which seals the optical disc from water and oxygen (3/1-10). The use of salts which react with water to cause corrosion of the reflective layer is disclosed. (6/14-7/43). The reaction of oxygen with leuco dyes to facilitate coloration is disclosed (7/45-8/16).

Kamiyama et al. '993 teaches the sealing of optical recording media which have sensitivity to moisture and/or light in bags which are filled with inert gasses to prevent deterioration of the media. The addition of dessicants, such as silica or an oxygen remover to enhance the ability of the packaging to prevent the deterioration of the media over an extended period of time is disclosed. (2/34-38).

Clearly the packaging used for optical recording media cannot be made entirely impermeable to water or oxygen (these are very small molecules), so the addition of dessicants

and oxygen removing agents (getters) are known to be desirable in the art to counteract this intrusion/diffusion as evidenced by Kamiyama et al. '993. Therefore the examiner holds that it would be inherent that the packaging of Rollhaus et al. '772 is inherently permeable to some degree to oxygen and/or water and it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to add dessicants and/or oxygen scavengers, such as those disclosed by Kamiyama et al. '993 to the embodiment of figure 3 of Rollhaus et al. '772 where the readout prevention is triggered by either of these to increase the storage stability of the medium.

8. Claims 4-7 and 14-17 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Martin J Angebranndt whose telephone number is 571-272-1378. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday and alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Huff can be reached on 571-272-1385. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9309 for regular communications and 703-872-9309 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.


Martin J Angebranndt
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1756

6/15/05